



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

#### IV.—DRAVIDIAN S.

The importance of the sound *s* for Dravidian philology seems to have been generally overlooked. In southern Dravidian, 5 and 6 begin with vowels. Two of the northern languages have native numerals above 4, and in both of them 5 and 6 begin with *s*. Caldwell's Comparative Grammar explains the *s* of these numerals as a "euphonic prefix." The models found in Greek and Eranian allow us to construct a more useful theory of Dravidian *s*. An early *s* was regularly changed to *h* in the south, and sometimes in the north; afterward the sound *h* was often lost, as it has been in modern Greek. We must therefore look into northern Dravidian, if we wish to understand the history of the southern languages.

The chief northern divisions are Brâhui, Gôndi, Kui, Kurukh-Malto. The isolated Brâhui, spoken in the extreme northwest near the Afghan border, is more closely akin to Kurukh-Malto than to any other division, according to Konow, who compiled the Dravidian section of the Linguistic Survey of India. Aside from Brâhui, the northern speech-districts adjoin those of the Kolarian or Munda family, lying in the region south of the Ganges. Former contact with Kolarian seems to be implied by Brâhui *urā* (house), beside *urā* (house) in Kûrku, the westernmost of the Kolarian tongues. Brâhui *urā* is probably connected with Gôndi *rôn* (house) and southern *ūr*, *ûru* (village).<sup>1</sup>

The southern languages are Kanara, Kêlan, Tamil, Telugu, Tulu. Kêlan might be called a Tamil dialect, if it had not developed a separate literature. The greater conservatism of the southern languages is shown by the native numerals, including words for 100: Kanara *nūrū*, Tamil *nūdru*, Telugu *nūrū*, Tulu *nūdu* < \**nūtro*. But Aryan elements are of course mixed in with the vocabulary, and we may suspect traces of Kolarian influence too. Besides such words as Telugu *nippu* = Tamil

<sup>1</sup> A good account of Brâhui is to be found in Bray's Grammar (Calcutta, 1909). For the other northern languages I have used mainly the Linguistic Survey, vol. 4 (Calcutta, 1906).

*neruppu* (fire), Kanara *kircu* (fire), and Kanara *beṇki* (fire) connected with *bē*—Tamil *vē*—(burn), we find Tulu *tū*=Tamil *tī* (fire). These last look like relatives of Savara *to*, *tōgi* (fire), recorded in the Kolarian word-lists of the Linguistic Survey, vol. 4, p. 251. It is remarkable that the other Kolarian languages have words meaning 'fire' entirely different from Savara *to*, *tōgi*, and that similar words occur in Indo-Chinese: *tu*, *to*, *tə*, *te*.<sup>1</sup> In any case the Tulu *ū* implies a change of *oi* or *ui* to *ī* in Tamil.<sup>2</sup>

Kanara and Telugu have alphabets fundamentally the same, differing hardly more than our script and print. Their spellings agree fairly well with modern speech, and may be assumed to represent the older sounds. The letters corresponding to palatal occlusives, here transliterated *c* and *ç*, may have been read as affricates when these languages were first written. Early Kanara and Telugu have a letter that may be called the *ṛ*-symbol. It was probably sounded like Castilian *rr*; the modern languages use the ordinary *r*-symbol instead of *ṛ*. Kanara now uses *ḷ* (reverted *l*) for the older *ṛ* (reverted *r*). Spoken Kanara has affricates like those of English *charge*, and spoken Telugu has *ts*, *dz*, or intermediate sounds, where the spelling indicates the simple occlusives *c* and *ç*. The occlusive element is lengthened where the written symbol is doubled; popular transcriptions such as "*chch*" and "*tsts*", unfortunately used in serious works dealing with these languages, imply sound-groups impossible in the southern Dravidian languages.<sup>3</sup>

The Kanara alphabet has been adopted for Tulu, the non-

<sup>1</sup> T'oung-pao, vol. 17, p. 42 (mars, 1916).

<sup>2</sup> In addition to Caldwell's Comparative Grammar and the Linguistic Survey, I have used the following works for southern Dravidian: Kittel, Kannaḍa-English Dictionary (Mangalore, 1894); Arden, Tamil Grammar (Vepery, 1910); Pope, Tamil-English Dictionary (Oxford, 1905); Pope, Tamil Handbook (Oxford, 1911); Pope, The 'Sacred' Kural (London, 1886), with a translation and a vocabulary; Vinson, Manuel de la langue tamoule (Paris, 1903); Wickremasinghe, Tamil Grammar (London, 1906); Morris, Telugu Grammar (London, 1890).

<sup>3</sup> Similar mis-transcriptions are common also in books dealing with northern Dravidian: here the lack of native literatures forbids even the use of *cc* and *çç*, justified by historic reasons in the literary languages of the south.

literary member of the southern group, spoken around Mangalore on the west coast. Where Kanara spelling differs from the modern sounds, Tulu should be transcribed in accordance with the sounds. Thus we must use *tš*, *ttš*, *dž*, *ddž*, in transcriptions of Tulu, not *c*, *cc*, *z*, *zz*, as in Kanara; and initial *je*, *jē*, *wo*, *wō*, instead of the simple vowels represented by Kanara spelling. In the southern languages the sound *j* (= *y* in *you*) is added as a hiatus-filler before palatal vowels, and *w* or *v* (< *w*) before labial vowels, when the preceding word ends in a vowel that cannot be elided. These added sounds are often kept in speech after a pause; in the written forms of isolated words, the ordinary spellings of Kanara and Tamil use the vowel-symbols alone. In Tulu the added sounds have apparently become fixed. Tulu seems to have the sound *w* where the *v*-symbol of the Kanara alphabet is written. The distinction of *v* and *w* is not clear, even in the Aryan languages. Sanskrit has a single symbol for *w* and for *v*, the latter having replaced the former except after less sonorous sounds.<sup>1</sup> In Marāṭi the *v*-sound is said to be rather weak (bi-labial?), and English *v* is transcribed as *vh*.<sup>2</sup> Caldwell tells us that *w* is generally used for *v* in spoken Kanara, and sometimes in Tamil. Indoportuguese has changed *v* to *w*,<sup>3</sup> evidently under the influence of neighboring Aryan or Dravidian tongues. Thus it is possible that the old *w*, or the intermediate bi-labial *v*, has been kept in many regions of India. As the native alphabets fail to distinguish *v* and *w*, the history of these sounds is obscure.<sup>4</sup>

The Tamil alphabet was at first used for writing Sanskrit. This is shown by its former lack of symbols distinguishing the quantity of long and short *e* and *o*. In early Dravidian these vowels could be short or long; but the short vowels did not occur in Sanskrit. Written Latin can be understood without length-marks: in the same way the quantity of *e* and *o* was left

<sup>1</sup> Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 57 (Boston, 1891).

<sup>2</sup> Bloch, *Formation de la langue marathe*, § 153 (Paris, 1915).

<sup>3</sup> *Revista lusitana*, vol. 6, p. 67; vol. 9, p. 150.

<sup>4</sup> My direct source for Tulu is the *poṣa woḍambaḍike* (New Testament) published by the B. and F. Bible Society, printed at the Basel Mission Press (Mangalore, 1894). Indirect sources are the *Grammar of Brigel*, as quoted by Caldwell, and the *Dictionary of Männer*, as quoted by Kittel. The *Linguistic Survey* omits Tulu.

for the reader to guess, when the Tamil alphabet came to be used for Tamil. The modern use of modified symbols for Tamil  $\bar{e}$  and  $\bar{o}$  is ascribed to the influence of Beschi (an Italian missionary) and other Europeans, who naturally felt the need of such symbols more than natives would.

It is generally held that Sanskrit *ghōṭa* (horse) is a Dravidian loan-word, connected with the equivalent Kanara *kudure*, Tamil *kudirai*, Telugu *gurramu*.<sup>1</sup> Formally it belongs with Kanara *karte*, Tamil *karudai*, Telugu *gāḍide* (ass), derived from *\*ghaṛotas*. Sanskrit developed the stem *\*ghaṛuṭa* > *\*ghauṭa*, with  $\ddot{t}$  for  $t$  by assimilation to  $z$ , a sound which afterward disappeared from Sanskrit.<sup>2</sup> We may assume that the horse was once unknown in India: when it was introduced, Dravidians at first gave it the name of its relative, *\*ghaṛotas*, and some of the Aryans borrowed the word in its altered sense. The old meaning is kept in two later loan-words, with  $r$  for Dravidian  $\ddot{r}$  (< $z$ ), Sanskrit *khara* and *gardabha*. The *kh* corresponds to the Tamil unvoicing of occlusives or the Kanara unvoicing of aspirates; *g-bh* instead of *gh-bh* was a normal development in Sanskrit.<sup>3</sup> Dravidian *\*ghuteras* (horse) meant 'runner' like our *horse* beside Latin *curr*-<*\*kurs*:- the verb-root *kud*-<*\*ghut*- is seen in Kanara *kuduku*- (trot), Tamil *kudi*- (leap).<sup>4</sup>

The consonant-system of ancient Dravidian was nearly the same as that of Sanskrit. The early use of aspirated occlusives, now rare in the south and unknown in Tamil, is shown by the evidence mentioned above. All occlusives became voiceless in Tamil more than two thousand years ago; afterward simple occlusives became voiced between voiced sounds. The basis of Tamil spelling goes back to the time when all occlusives were

<sup>1</sup> Kittel, K. Dictionary, p. xx.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, § 222.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, § 155. The Aryans perhaps mistook the ending of later *\*kharotas* for a demonstrative, and therefore dropped it. The ending of *gardabha* may have come from the synonym *rāsabha*.

<sup>4</sup> The form *\*khuteras*, a normal development from *\*ghuteras* in some of the Dravidian tongues, corresponds to loan-words found in southern Kolarian: Gadaba *krutā*, Savara *kurtā*. Gōndi *kōṛā* is a composite of such a *k*-form and the Aryan word represented by Kui *gōṛā*, Kurukh *ghōṛō*. The *gh* of older *\*ghuteras* (preserved by Aryan mediation?) is found in Gōndi *ghuriā* = Kurukh *ghuṛī* (mare).

voiceless. Tamil has developed no distinctive voiced occlusives, and can therefore get along with a spelling that represents all occlusives as voiceless sounds. But spelling has been adapted to speech where the occlusives became fricatives ( $c > \xi > j$  and  $p > b > v$ ). Because of other possible changes, it would hardly be safe to transliterate the spelling mechanically. Thus if we wrote 'atu' for *adu*=Kanara *adu* (that thing), on the ground that the Tamil consonant-letter really means *t*, we might be inventing an unreasonable form. We know nothing about the relative chronology of  $t > d$  and  $o > u$ ; the ancient Kanara-Tamil form was perhaps \**ato*, or \**ate*=Telugu *adi*.

Early Tamil has a letter representing *h*, now read as the velar fricative  $x$  (=Russian  $x$  before *a*). The eighteen consonant-letters of ordinary Tamil may be transliterated *k* (*g*),  $\eta$ , *c* ( $\xi$ ),  $\tilde{n}$ ,  $\dot{t}$  ( $\dot{d}$ ),  $\tilde{n}$ ,  $\dot{t}$  ( $\dot{d}$ ), *n*, *p* (*b*), *m*, *j*, *r*, *l*, *v*,  $\tilde{r}$ ,  $\dot{l}$ , *r* (*rt*, *tr*, *dr*), *n*. A few other letters may be added in the Tamil spelling of Aryan loan-words: they correspond to the Sanskrit symbols for  $\xi$  (read as *dž*),  $\dot{s}$ , *s*, *h*. Spoken Tamil has the velar fricative  $\gamma$  for  $g < k$  between vowels; in the extreme south, *h* may replace  $\gamma$ . The age of  $\gamma$  is uncertain: as Sanskrit had no  $\gamma$ , ancient Tamil spelling would not have used a separate symbol for such a non-distinctive sound. Initial *c* has developed thru *cç* to  $\xi$  and  $\dot{s}$  in spoken Tamil. The same medial sound-change, with a formation of *cç* earlier than the voicing of occlusives between vowels, was widespread in spoken Tamil, so that the *c*-symbol now represents  $\xi$  or  $\dot{s}$  between vowels. The older affricate, resembling English *tch*, is used for *cc* and for *c* following another occlusive. The group written as  $\tilde{n}c$  corresponds to spoken *ndž*: occlusives were voiced after nasals earlier than between vowels. Where *j* stands for pre-literary *c*, it indicates dialect-mixture: in a portion of the Tamilian territory, medial *c* following a vowel was (like the *c* of the group  $\tilde{n}c$ ) changed to  $\xi$  before initial *cç* was developed from *c*. Medial *cç* was not subject to voicing; medial *c* became  $\xi$  where it did not undergo an earlier change to *cç*.<sup>1</sup>

The distinction of two *n*-symbols in Tamil seems to be merely graphic: the first is written initially and in the group *nd* < *nt*,

<sup>1</sup> Kittel's Dictionary, which gives Tamil cognates in Kanara characters, misrepresents  $\xi < c$  as *dž* between vowels.

the second in all other positions. Corresponding to the  $\bar{r}$ -symbol of early Kanara and Telugu, Tamil has a letter formerly sounded as  $\bar{r}$  (strongly trilled  $r$ ) between vowels. It represents spoken  $dr$  after  $n$ , and the doubled letter represents  $ttr$ , which may be reduced to  $tt$ . It is read as  $t$  or as  $r$  before a consonant; a following occlusive is voiceless, not voiced as after the ordinary  $r$ . These variations seem to imply an ancient  $rt$ , which became  $dr$  between vowels; similarly  $rtt$  became  $ttr$ . The group  $ndr$  is derived from  $nr$  and from  $ndn$ : it was naturally written with the old  $rt$ -symbol after the  $dr$ -value was established. We may use  $dr$  and  $\bar{r}$  between vowels, to show the older and the more recent values. It seems possible that  $\bar{r} < dr$  and  $rt$  came from voiceless  $r$ , but we know so little of Tamil phonology that it can hardly be proved.<sup>1</sup>

Brâhui keeps initial  $s$  before vowels. A clear example is  $sar$ - (be well cooked, rot), beside Kanara  $ar$ -,  $ari$ - (destroy, perish, rot),  $aral$  (grief),  $aral$ - (grieve),  $arhu$ - (be rotten), Tamil  $aral$  (fire),  $aralu$ - (burn),  $arartci$  (pain),  $ari$ - (destroy, perish),  $arugu$ - (rot). The basic meaning of these words is 'destroy' or 'perish'; derivatives are 'burn, pain' and 'be burned, be cooked'. The sense of Kanara  $aral$  has perhaps been modified by that of  $ar$ -,  $aru$ - (weep), which has a different root, as is shown by Gôndi  $ar$ - (weep) with no initial  $h$ . Dravidian  $sar$ - and  $ar$ - (rot) are Aryan loan-words corresponding to Hindi  $sar$ -,  $sar$ - (rot).

Other Brâhui examples are perhaps  $sarr$ - (grow up) beside Kanara  $aralu$ -,  $alaru$ - (blossom, open, spread), Tamil  $alar$ - (blossom); and  $sur$ - (move) beside Kanara  $uralu$ -,  $urulu$ -,  $urlu$ - (roll), Tamil  $urulu$ - (roll). As Latin 'stand' makes Hispanic 'be', we may compare Brâhui  $sal$ - (stand) with Gôndi  $hille$  (not), Kui  $side$ - (is not), Kanara  $illa$  (is not), Tamil  $illai$  (is not), Telugu  $lê$ - (is not), Tulu  $iddži$  (not). The Brâhui  $a$  agrees with that of  $xaf$  beside palatal vowels in the equivalent Kurukh  $xebdā$ , Kanara  $kivi$ , Tamil  $cevi$ , Telugu  $cevi$ , Tulu  $kebi$  (ear). A suffixed vowel may mark negation in Dravidian, so there is no difficulty about the sense of the

<sup>1</sup> Spoken Tamil confuses  $\bar{r}$  and  $r$ , but the  $\bar{r}$  of  $kīristu$  indicates a recent leveling. Many natives learned the word from Beschi, who must have used in *Cristo* a sound more strongly trilled than the ordinary Tamil  $r$ .

words corresponding to Brâhui *sal-*. Tulu *iddži* has normal *dži* < *dri*, as in *wondži*=Tamil *ondru* (one), *mūdži*=Tamil *mūndru* (three); it seems to be formally the same as Tamil *indri* (not being). The Kui *ḍ* agrees with that of *iḍu*=Tamil *il*, Telugu *illu* (house).

From Brâhui *ka-*, Gôndi *sā-*, Kui *sā-*, Kurukh-Malto *ke*, Kanara *sā-*, *sa-*, Tamil *cā-*, *ce-*, Telugu *cā-*, *ca-*, Tulu *sai-* (die), it is clear that *s* may come from *c* in Gôndi and Kui. Most of the Gôndi dialects changed an early *s* to *h* before the later *s* was formed from *c*; Kui has kept the older *s*. But Gôndi and Kui are near neighbors, so it is not strange that a few Gôndi dialects shared the leveling with Kui. The Linguistic Survey records *sā-* (die) beside *šilā* (not) in one (p. 505), with *š* for *s* before a palatal vowel; and *hā-* (die) beside *hille* (not) in another (p. 543). Both of these dialects confused the old *s* and *s* < *c*; one of them changed the resultant to *h*. Some of the Gôndi dialects have *halle* instead of *hille*, and one has both *hale* and *hile* (L. S., p. 526), showing that the two forms are separate words. The *h* of *hille* was added to *\*alle*, which came from the root represented by Brâhui *alla-* (was not), Kurukh *mal-* (is not), Malto *mal-* (is not), Kanara *alla* (is not), Tamil *alla* (is not); in Kurukh-Malto the initial *m* was added under the influence of *men-* (be).

Initial *ṣ*, treated like *s* in the south, makes Brâhui *š*: *šalāp*=Kanara *alambu-*, Tamil *alambu-*, Telugu *alamu-* (wash). Other examples are perhaps *šir-* (smooth out) beside Kanara *iṛaku-*, *iṛi-* (press), Tamil *idrukku-* (tighten); and *šurr-* (scratch) beside Kanara *ore-* (grind, rub, touch), Tamil *urai-* (rub). Gôndi and Kui have *s* for initial *ṣ*. In the numerals 4—7, Gôndi *nālūṅg*, *saijūṅg*, *sārūṅg*, *jērūṅg*, Kui *nālgi*, *siṅgi*, *sadžgi*, *odgi*, Kanara *nālku*, *aidu*, *āru*, *ēru*, Tamil *nāngu*, *aindu*, *ādru*, *ēru*, Telugu *nālugu*, *aidu*, *āru*, *ēdu*, Tulu *nāl*, *ain*, *ādži*, *jēl*, the widespread *k* or *g* of 4 seems to be radical. Gôndi and Kui have extended the endings of 4 to 5—7. The Dravidian stems of 5 and 6 were apparently *\*šain*, *\*šatro*. The *n* of 5 was often altered and lost in contact with initial consonants, so that many of the derivatives lack a nasal: thus Kanara has *ainūru* (500), *aivattu* (50), *aivaru* (five persons).

Lack of material makes it hard to say how initial *s* was treated in Kurukh-Malto; we should expect it to be kept as in Brâhui.



The northern treatment of medial *s* is shown by Brâhui *ras-*, Gôndi *avv-*, Kui *ânâb*, Kurukh-Malto *ârs-* (arrive), probably derived from *\*arans-*. Gôndi has *avv-* < *\*arv-* < *\*araw-* < *\*arâh-*: medial *h* was lost, and *r* was assimilated to hiatus-filling *v* < *w*, in accordance with *kis* = Kanara *kircu* (fire). Kui *ânâb-*, with normal *b* for the *v* kept in other dialects, represents *\*arnaw-* < *\*arnah-*; medial *s* was weakened to *h* and lost as in Gôndi. Telugu has *râ* < *\*aranso*, used as the imperative of *va-* (come). An early southern *s* is implied by Tamil *âjiram* (thousand), derived from Sanskrit *sahasra*. If there had been no *s* in Tamil when the Sanskrit word was borrowed, the Tamil form would be *\*âram*. The sound-group *sr* was unknown in early Dravidian: *sahasra* was adopted as *\*sāsara* or *\*sāsera*, and the loss of *h* < *s* caused *j* to be added as a hiatus-filler. The Tamil *m* need not be connected with the same Sanskrit ending; neuter *a*-stems take *m* as the nominative-ending in Tamil.

Tamil *ai* is common as a stressless ending, but rare otherwise. It seems likely that the ending *-ai* was derived from *-as* or *-ās*, or from both; similarly Italian has *i* for final *s* in *dai* < *das*, *poi* < *post*, *voi* < *uos*. Tamil has *-ai* for the final vowel of Sanskrit *ā*-stems in loan-words. This does not indicate a change of *ā* to *ai* in Tamil: it shows that early Tamil had the noun-ending *-ās* and used it for Aryan *-ā*. The stressless ending *-ā* is extremely rare in Tamil nouns, and is a variant of older *-avu*.

Since the foregoing was written, I have found *il-* (stand) in the Malto Gospels (Agra, 1881-82). Some of the forms have a suffixed stem *idž-* (for *\*ildž-*), and there is a corresponding *iddž-* (stand) in Kurukh. These verbs are evidently connected with Brâhui *sal-* (< *\*sil-*?), and show that initial *s* has been lost in Kurukh-Malto. Another example seems to be Kurukh *abrā* (those things), presumably derived from Aryan *sarva* (all) and the general demonstrative *a* or *ā*. The form *ibrā* (these things) could be analogic: after *\*sabrā* changed to *abrā*, its use as the plural of *ād* (< *\*ate*) produced *ibrā* as the plural of *īd* < *\*ite*. A stressless variant of *\*sil-* is probably represented by Kurukh *atl-*, *tal-* (be), the development being *tal-* < *atl-* < *\*astl-* < *\*asl-* < *\*sl-*. The added *t* may be compared with *ṭ* in Kanara *kriṣṭṇa*, a semi-popular variant of *kiṭṭa* < *kriṣṇa* (Krishna).

Other words with *s* before a consonant are hard to find. Initial *sn* may be assumed for the root of the following verbs: Brâhui *hur-* (look), Gôndi *hūr-* (see), Kui *sūd-* (see), Malto *ṭund-* (see), Kanara *nōd-*, *nōr-* (look, see), Tamil *nōkku-* (look at), Telugu *cūc-*, *cūd-* (see), Tulu *tū-* (see). Brâhui could have developed *h* from *sn* thru *N* (voiceless *n*). Gôndi and Kui leveled early *s* and *s* < *sN* < *sn*; Gôndi *s* became *h* at a later time. Gôndi variants are *hūr-*, *hur-*, *hur-*, *hud-*; and *sur-*, as we should expect, in the dialect that has *šilā* = *hille*. Malto seems to have formed *t* from *N*: *sn* > *sN* > *st* > *t*. The *t* became *ṭ* by assimilation in *ṭund-*; the nasal may imply *\*snud-* > *\*snund-*, with extension as in Spanish *mancha* < *macula*. Tamil has lost *ḍ* before the *k*-suffix of the verb, but it has the corresponding noun *nōṭṭam* = Kanara *nōṭā* (sight), apparently derived from earlier *\*snōḍḍans* or something similar. Likewise the Telugu verb has lost *ḍ* in the forms that take a *c*-suffix: *\*tūḍc-* developed thru *\*tūc-* to *cūc*, with internal assimilation, and then produced analogic *cūd-* for *\*tūḍ-*. Tulu *tū-* has the dialectic variants *sū-*, *hū-*.

A basis *\*nisatro* seems to be implied by Gôndi *nīr*, Kanara *nīru*, Tamil *nīdru*, Telugu *niguru*, *nivuru*, *nīru* (ashes). The *ī*-forms probably indicate assimilation following the loss of *s*: *ia* > *ie* > *ī*. The Telugu variants could have come from *\*nisotro* > *\*niwotro*, with the *a* assimilated to *o*. The change of *w* to *g* has parallels in European languages, as French *garde* (ward), *guêpe* (wasp), *guerre* (war). If the foregoing nouns are to be connected with Brâhui *his* (ashes), we may assume a root *\*snis*, with dissimilative loss of initial *s* in Gôndi and southern Dravidian.

Brâhui *nibbar* (weak) and *nizzōr* (weak) look like dialectal variants from a single basis, *\*nizvar* < *\*niswar*. By a sense-development 'long—thin—weak', they may be connected with the following words: Kanara *nigar-*, *nigur-*, *nimir-*, *nīḍ-*, *nīl-* (extend), Tamil *nīl* (long). The *m* of *nimir-* (< *\*niwar-*) has a close parallel in Portuguese *uma*, derived from older *ūa* (< *ūna*) thru *\*ūwa* and *\*ūwā*.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.